

**Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant
(SPF SIG)
Evaluation Workgroup Meeting
DMHA Conference Room
August 18th , 2006**

ATTENDEES: Bob Levy, Jeff Barber, Sheila Nesbitt via phone, Harold Kooreman, Rebecca Smith, Marcia French, John Viernes Jr., Gary Williams, and Lin Montgomery.

WELCOME

Bob Levy opened the meeting with a welcome and around-the-room introduction. Lin Montgomery was asked to give a brief professional background.

UPDATES

Staffing Report:

Added to the Workgroup was Lin Montgomery and a suggestion made to add the Training Director of PRC.

UPDATE REPORTS

A review of the Priority Document from the SEOW was done. The document does not list priorities in order of importance but rather the priorities are state- wide verses localized areas of concern.

Discussed concerns about our task to keep the SAC informed and knowledgeable about the entire process with the SPF SIG Project and the need to offer educational pieces during the SAC and possibly SEOW meetings. Voted and agreed to have a one page evaluation handed out at the end of each meeting to establish outcome/satisfaction ratings. Sheila will look to other states for an evaluation that will be appropriate. Sheila stated that a system, called DataBase Builder, has been piloted in Iowa and a few other states, but that there is no one system that all states are using. CSAP is allowing each state to chose what works best for their individual needs.

Harold reported that he and Eric were focusing and discussing a one page qualitative evaluation for the meetings also and an evaluation for the overall grant. They have decided to use a web-based data collection process. Two electronic reporting systems were discussed; COMET TRAINING and CORDA, a system the staff had sent to Eric and Harold to review last week. Discussion was had about collecting data, processing and updating of the information and the importance of it being easy for all to use. Lin will send information to Harold and Eric on the COMET. A question was posed as to whether CSAP had already in place a data base system that all states were encouraged to use. Sheila stated

that a system had been piloted in Iowa but nothing was being used for all states. They have created a data based builder and are allowing each state to chose what works best for their individual needs.

The workgroup reviewed the funding distribution allocation strategies that will be presented to the Executive Committee next week.

Lin asked that capacity be defined from the SPF SIG prospective. Capacity was discussed as building infrastructures , showing support and building data collection capabilities. The importance of informing the sub recipients that building capacity is a requirement of the grant was also mentioned.

A discussion of the 'Lessons Learned' document identified the need to clearly state upfront that the project would be evolving and changing, but the clearer we could be in the beginning with outlining expectations the better. Requests from the first SIG for more technical support led to a discussion of the PIRE who was already charged with the responsibility to work with Eric and Harold on identifying qualifiers that would need to be evaluated and then to have PIRE do trainings with the SAC. The PRC is to provide technical assistance and it was agreed that it would be advantageous to get the training director to sit as a member of the Evaluation Work group as soon as possible. Jeff mentioned that we may also have resources that should be considered from the members of the SAC. Questioned posed: When do we begin with PRC and their evaluation? Eric and Harold will request from PIRE when they would like to be trained and then we'll decide when they will come to train the SAC. It will be after the priorities are set and the strategies are established that the charge of TA will be provided by PRC. WSTAT focuses it's trainings on cross-site and state focused needs, where PIRE is typically more focused on epi-workgroups.

Marcia is to contact David Bozell to inquire about the position vacancy with the PRC Training Director and then to report to Bob so he can invite him to serve on the workgroup.

The clearer the expectations in the beginning with the sub recipients, the less frustration they will experience and the better the evaluation focus can be.

Next Meeting Focuses:

- ❖ To review the evaluations provided from the 2 states, the Cross-Site Evaluation and "Lessons Learned" from the first SPF.

- ❖ Identify what we can extract from the documents that will be advantageous to IN SPF SIG

MEETING SCHEDULE

The next meeting will be September 26th, at 10:30 am.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by the Chair.